

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00101 081512Z

54

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

INRE-00 USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-11

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 /089 W

----- 043081

O R 081406Z MAR 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1482

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0101

NOFORN

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: SUMMARY OF FORCE DEFINITION DISCUSSION WITH SOVIETS  
OF 3 MARCH

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: ON MARCH 3, AT SOVIET INVITATION, US REP,  
DEPREP, AND JCS REP MET WITH SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV, SHUSTOV,  
AND SOVIET MILREP KAPITONOV.

2. US REP URGED AN EARLY EXCHANGE OF OVERALL DATA, NOTING THAT  
THE ABSENCE OF SUCH AN EXCHANGE REINFORCED SKEPTICS WHO BELIEVED  
THERE MAY BE NO OUTCOME TO THE NEGOTIATIONS. KHLESTOV RESPONDED  
THAT FOR PROGRESS TO BE MADE IN THE TALKS, OTHER QUESTIONS HAD  
TO BE RESOLVED FIRST, SUCH AS WHICH COUNTRIES WOULD REDUCE AND

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00101 081512Z

WHAT BRANCHES OF THE ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE COVERED.

3. KHLESTOV SUGGESTED THAT IF A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF A FORCE DEFINITION COULD BE FOUND, THERE COULD BE MOVEMENT "IN OTHER AREAS." HOWEVER, THE LACK OF AGREEMENT ON THE ALLOCATION OF THREE DISPUTED FORCES WAS HINDERING THE ENTIRE DEFINITION DISCUSSION.

4. REPLYING TO A QUESTION PUT AT AN INFORMAL SESSION, KHLESTOV ADMITTED THAT IT WAS LOGICAL FOR THE WEST TO ASK ON WHAT FIGURES THE NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL FOR 2-3 PERCENT REDUCTIONS WAS BASED. BUT, BEFORE THIS QUESTION COULD BE ANSWERED, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO DECIDE WHAT FORCES WERE INCLUDED AND EXCLUDED. PRIOR TO THAT, HOWEVER, IT WAS NECESSARY TO AGREE ON THE THREE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF A FORCE DEFINITION, PARTICULARLY THE ALLOCATION PRINCIPLE.

5. US REP OBSERVED THAT THE 2-3 PERCENT PROPOSAL AND THE CONTINUED SOVIET INTEREST IN ALLOCATIONS MADE IT CLEAR THAT BOTH SIDES WERE LOOKING TOWARD AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. KHLESTOV SAID IT WAS AN UNQUESTIONED FACT THAT DATA WOULD BE NECESSARY, BUT A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS COULD BE SETTLED WITHOUT DATA AND THEIR SOLUTION SHOULD NOT BE HELD UP.

6. US REP SAID IT WAS ONLY LOGICAL ACCORDING TO THE MOST RECENT EASTERN PROPOSAL TO AGREE ON THE ISSUE OF WHO SHOULD BE INCLUDED AND WHO EXCLUDED FROM A FORCE COUNT. AS TO THE NEW SOVIET PROPOSAL TO AGREE IN PRINCIPLE ONLY ON THE ALLOCATION ISSUE, THE WEST COULD NOT CONSIDER ACCEPTANCE OF A POINT PROVIDING FOR POST-PONEMENT OF SOLUTION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES IN ISOLATION FROM THE OTHER TWO. AGREEMENT ONLY IN PRINCIPLE ON THE FIRST TWO POINTS WAS NOT ACCEPTABLE. FULL SATISFACTION WAS NECESSARY ON A FULL TEXT OF THE FIRST TWO PARTS OF THE DEFINITION, PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF THE THIRD.

7. KHLESTOV RESPONDED THAT ALL THREE PRINCIPLES SHOULD RECEIVE EQUAL TREATMENT. FOLLOWING AGREEMENT TO THE PRINCIPLES, PARTICIPANTS COULD THEN BEGIN WORK ON A FULL TEXT BY WORKING OUT THE DETAILS OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLE, COMPREHENSIVENESS. KHLESTOV SAID THAT US REPS HAD MENTIONED THE DRAFT DEFINITIONS EXCHANGED IN DECEMBER. IN THESE TEXTS EACH HAD PRESENTED SOME IDEAS,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00101 081512Z

BUT NO AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED ON THEM AND THE DISCUSSION HAD BEEN WITHOUT ANY RESULT.

8. WHEN US REPS INDICATED THEY WERE NOT INTERESTED IN CONTINUING THE PRESENT DISCUSSION UNLESS INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS COULD BE DISCUSSED SPECIFICALLY, SOVIET REPS STATED THEY WISHED TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ON WESTERN DEFINITIONS. WHAT WAS MEANT BY EXCLUDING UNIFORMED PERSONNEL OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS EQUIPPED

WITH WEAPONS? US REP SAID SUCH ELEMENTS AS BORDER FORCES WERE INTENDED. KHLESTOV SAID A MORE PRECISE FORMULATION MIGHT BE NEEDED.

9. SHUSTOV ASKED IF THE CIVILIANS THE WEST WOULD EXCLUDE WERE THOSE WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE ARMY AND HOW THAT WAS JUSTIFIABLE. THE US HAD CIVILIANS WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO MILITARY POSITIONS IN THEIR FORCES AND FUNCTIONED THE SAME AS MILITARY PERSONNEL. DID NOT THE US ARMY EMPLOY CIVILIANS TO PERFORM GUARD DUTY? US REPS RESPONDED THAT ALL CIVILIANS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. IT WAS TO THE ADVANTAGE OF THE EAST THAT ONLY ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BE COUNTED.

10. KHLESTOV THEN RAISED THE ISSUE OF THE FRG STANDBY READINESS FORCE, SAYING IT WAS A SPECIAL CATEGORY AND SHOULD NOT BE COUNTED AMONG THE RESERVES, WHICH SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. US REP RESPONDED THAT THERE WERE RESERVES IN THE EAST WHICH WERE THE SAME IN ALL PRACTICAL RESPECTS, BUT IN LARGER NUMBERS. MOREOVER, IT WOULD BE MORE LOGICAL TO INCLUDE POLISH INTERNAL DEFENSE AND TERRITORIAL FORCES IN THE DEFINITION THAN TO INCLUDE THESE FRG RESERVISTS.

11. KHLESTOV CLOSED THE MEETING BY ASKING FOR ANOTHER BILATERAL LATER IN THE WEEK. NEW IDEAS HAD BEEN DEVELOPED DURING THE PRESENT MEETING WHICH MIGHT BE INTERESTING. US REPS AGREED TO MEET AGAIN ON MARCH 5.

END SUMMARY. FULL RECORD OF MEETING SENT VIA AIRGRAM.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** ARMED FORCES, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 08 MAR 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976MBFRV00101  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760087-0372  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19760384/aaaacwoq.tel  
**Line Count:** 143  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 01 APR 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <01 APR 2004 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <27 JUL 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SUMMARY OF FORCE DEFINITION DISCUSSION WITH SOVIETS OF 3 MARCH  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR, NATO  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006